

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

In re Patent Application of:  
Edward R. Howorka et al.

Application No.: 10/781,703

Confirmation No.: 4196

Filed: February 20, 2004

Art Unit: 3693

For: VOCALISATION OF TRADING DATA IN  
TRADING SYSTEMS

---

Examiner: Jessica Lemieux

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

MS Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

A telephone interview between Examiner Lemieux and applicants' undersigned representative was conducted on January 22, 2010. The following is a statement of the substance of the interview.

During the interview, applicants' undersigned representative discussed the feature recited, e.g., in independent claim 20, by which at least a portion of data distributed to a trader workstation by the trading system is an identifier that facilitates an audible announcement of an identifier unique to the institution or party to which the workstation belongs, or unique to each trading floor to which the trader workstation belongs.

As was discussed during the interview, in prior systems, a trading floor that received audible trading data might share this information by, for example, having a telephone receiver off the hook, allowing, for example, a client of the trading floor to hear the data. The audible

announcement of the recited unique identifier at the trading floor would dissuade and embarrass the trading floor from sharing audible trading data with parties that have not paid for it.

The recited unique identifier is information relating to the legitimate destination of the audible data, which is audibly announced at the location of the legitimate destination. As was pointed out during the interview, and in the most recent response, the information in the secondary reference Har, relied upon in the previous Office Action to meet the feature of the unique identifier, does not relate in any way to the legitimate destination of the information. That is, unlike the unique identifier in the independent claims, Har's information does not identify the intended recipient of the data.

The Examiner stated that, in view of the interview, she had a better understanding of the feature believed by applicants to differ from the cited prior art and said that she would give careful reconsideration to the arguments presented in the most recent response.

Dated: February 8, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa  
Joseph W. Ragusa  
Registration No.: 38,586  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1633 Broadway  
New York, New York 10019-6708  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant